

**REMARKS**

This communication is a full and timely response to the aforementioned non-final Office Action dated October 18, 2007. By this communication, claims 16-18 are added. Claims 1-6 and 8-15 are not amended and remain in the application. Thus, claims 1-18 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**I. Allowed Claims**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for kindly allowing claims 5, 9-11, 13 and 15. No amendments have been made to the allowed claims.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Miyawaki (U.S. 6,032,001). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites an equipment management apparatus for transmitting management information collected from a plurality of equipment to a centralized management apparatus. Claim 1 recites that the equipment management apparatus comprises a detector for detecting a trouble which has occurred in a first image forming apparatus for forming an image on a sheet.

Claim 1 also recites that the equipment management apparatus comprises a transmission controller for, when the trouble is detected by the detector, transmitting management information about a second image forming apparatus for forming an image on a sheet, which is independent from the first image forming apparatus, together with the trouble information about the first image forming apparatus to the centralized management apparatus.

Claim 12 recites an equipment management system comprising the equipment management apparatus recited in claim 1. Claim 14 recites an equipment management method comprising steps corresponding to the operations of the equipment management apparatus recited in claims 1 and 12.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest all the recited features of independent claims 1, 12 and 14 for the following reasons.

Miyawaki discloses a remote diagnosis system that includes an image forming apparatus group 100 consisting of a plurality of image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5, a data communication apparatus 200 and a central controlling device 400 for communicating with the data communication apparatus via a communication line 300 (see Figure 1). Each of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 of the image forming apparatus group 100 and the data communication apparatus 200 are connected using a multi-drop connection configuration as shown in Figure 1 (see Column 3, lines 56-59). In particular, as shown in Figure 1, Miyawaki discloses that the plurality of image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 are each serially connected to each other, and that the image forming apparatus 100-1 is connected to the data communication apparatus 200.

Miyawaki discloses that each of the plurality of image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 is assigned a predetermined different device code (see Column 4, lines 23-24, and Column 5, lines 18-20). The central control apparatus 400 controls the remote diagnosis system to transfer request and alarm data from the image forming apparatus group 100 to the central control apparatus 400 through the data communication apparatus 200 by performing a polling operation (see Column 4, lines 39-43). During the polling operation, the central control apparatus 400 controls the data communication apparatus 200 to sequentially communicate with each image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 by the use of the unique device codes assigned to each image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5. The polling operation from the data communication apparatus 200, as illustrated in Figure 4, is executed by designating one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 and checking whether each image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 has communications data, such as an alarm, to send to the central control apparatus 400. Each image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 compares its own allocated device code with the device code included in a polling communication from the data communication apparatus 200. One of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 is recognized as being designated for the polling operation, when its device code matches the device code sent from the data communication apparatus 200. Then, the designated image

forming apparatus correspondingly starts outputting communication data to the central control apparatus 400 (see Column 5, line 62 to Column 6, line 19; Column 6, line 42 to Column 7, line 3; and Figure 4). Miyawaki discloses that the polling operation is continuously executed to each of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 in a predetermined sequence until a selecting operation, which has priority over the polling operation, is started (see Column 7, lines 22-25). The selecting operation of Miyawaki is similar to the polling operation in that the data communication apparatus 200 communicates with only one image forming apparatus at a time by using the respectively unique device codes of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5. However, in the selecting operation, the central control apparatus 400 controls the data communication apparatus 200 to communicate with a predetermined image forming apparatus (i.e., a selected one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5) at one time instead of sequentially polling each image forming apparatus (see Column 5, lines 14-25).

In an attempt to arrive at the subject matter of claims 1, 12 and 14, the Office asserted that Miyawaki discloses the features of the transmission controller of claims 1 and 12 and the corresponding step of claim 14 in Column 14, lines 15-57 and in Figures 1, 14 and 15. This assertion is not supportable.

The portions of Miyawaki referenced by the Examiner merely disclose that problems can be characterized as urgent or non-urgent and that such a characterization can be displayed on a display 142 of the corresponding image forming apparatus in which the problem occurred. In particular, Miyawaki discloses that if a controller of one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 has detected an urgent problem, the urgent problem can be reported to the central control apparatus 400 via the data communication apparatus 200, and the display 142 of the particular image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 can display an notification that the urgent problem has been reported (see Column 14, lines 15-32).

However, the portions of Miyawaki referenced by the Examiner, nor any other portions of Miyawaki, do not disclose or suggest that when the data communication apparatus 200 receives a problem notification from one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5, the data communication apparatus 200 transmits management information of another one of the image forming apparatus.

On the contrary, Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest that the reporting of urgent or non-urgent problems in any one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 causes or prompts the data communication apparatus 200 to transmit any information about any of the other image forming apparatus in the information forming apparatus group 100. Instead, the selecting and polling operations of Miyawaki dictate when an particular image forming apparatus communicates its problem to the central control apparatus 400 via the data communication apparatus 200. In particular, Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest any relationship between the transmission of an urgent or non-urgent problem from one image forming apparatus in conjunction with the transmission of management information from another one of the image forming apparatus, because they are performed independently and sequentially from one another.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest that when a trouble which has occurred in a first image forming apparatus is detected, management information about a second image forming apparatus, which is independent from the first transmitting apparatus, is transmitted together with the trouble information about the first image forming apparatus, as recited in claims 1, 12 and 14.

Therefore, Miyawaki fails to disclose or suggest all the recited features of at least claims 1, 12 and 14.

Furthermore, in view of the clear distinctions discussed above, one skilled in the art would not have reason or been motivated to modify Miyawaki in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the subject matter of claims 1, 12 and 14.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6 and 8 recite further distinguishing features over Miyawaki.

For instance, Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest that when one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 reports its urgent or non-urgent problem to the central control apparatus 400 via the data management apparatus 200, the data management apparatus 200 obtains the management information of another one of the image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5. On the contrary, the reporting of urgent and non-urgent problems by one of the image forming apparatus is performed

independently from the data management apparatus 200 obtaining or collecting management information from another one of the image forming apparatus.

Accordingly, Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 2.

In addition, new dependent claims 16-18 recite further distinguishing features over Miyawaki. New claims 16-18 each recite that the equipment management apparatus is independently connected to the first image forming apparatus and the second image forming apparatus. In contrast to new claims 16-18, Miyawaki discloses that the plurality of image forming apparatus 100-1 to 100-5 are each serially connected to each other, and that the image forming apparatus 100-1 is connected to the data communication apparatus 200 (see Column 3, lines 56-59, and Figure 1).

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Miyawaki does not disclose or suggest all the recited features of independent claims 1, 12 and 14, as well as claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 16-18 which depend therefrom.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 12 and 14, as well as claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 16-18 which depend therefrom, are patentable over Miyawaki.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 4, 2008

By:



Jonathan Bowser  
Jonathan Bowser  
Registration No. 54574

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620